Remarks

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed July 6, 2009 and an interview with Examiner Mitchell on November 2, 2009.

I.   Applicant's Interview Summary

Applicant acknowledges the courtesy of an interview between Examiner Jason Mitchell and Applicant's representatives Karl Kenna and Nathan Feld on November 2, 2009. During the course of the interview, the claims and the cited references were generally discussed. No agreement was reached between the parties.

II.   Summary of Examiner's Rejections

In the Office Action mailed July 6 2009, Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-15, and 20-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNeely et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,117,411 hereafter McNeely) in view of Dubovsky (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0055836). Claims 4, 11 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNeely in view of Dubovsky and Lamb (U.S. Patent No. 6,823,522).

III.   Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15 and 18, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15, 18, and 20-26. Reconsideration of the Application is respectfully requested.

IV.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed July 6 2009, Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-15, and 20-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNeely (U.S. Patent No. 7,117,411) in view of Dubovsky (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0055836). Claims 4, 11 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNeely in view of Dubovsky and Lamb (U.S. Patent No. 6,823,522).

Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

- 8 -

1.   (Currently Amended)   A system that provides a generic user interface testing framework, and allows a user to test and debug graphical user interfaces for software applications under development, comprising:

a computer including a computer readable medium, and a processor operating thereon;

a plurality of different software test tools, wherein each software test tool is operable to test a plurality of different graphical user interfaces (GUIs) for a plurality of different software applications, wherein each GUI is operable to receive a plurality of input commands, and wherein each software test tool is associated with a different tool-specific scripting language that is an abstraction of the plurality of input commands for each of the plurality of different GUIs, used only by that software test tool, that can be invoked by a user to test each GUI;

a test case input file stored on the computer readable medium, that contains a plurality of directives that are logical abstractions of actions that can be performed on a GUI, independent of any of the tool-specific scripting languages, wherein the test case input file can be edited and reused as necessary by the user to specify different directives for testing against a software application's GUI in any of the different software test tools; and

an interpretive engine that executes on the computer, and that includes a plurality of dynamically loaded libraries corresponding to the plurality of different software test tools, and including at least one library for each of the plurality of different software test tools wherein each library is a group of functions written in each tool-specific scripting language, wherein the interpretive engine receives the directives defined in the test case input file, identifies which libraries are required, loads the required libraries associated with the software test tool the user is currently using, maps the directives to the software test tool's associated tool-specific scripting language, uses the software test tool to perform the testing operations on the software application's GUI using the associated tool-specific scripting language, and reports to the user the success or failure of the testing operations.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a test case input file stored on the computer readable medium, that contains a plurality of directives that are logical abstractions of actions that can be performed on a GUI, independent of any of the tool-specific scripting languages.

Applicant respectfully submits that both McNeely and Dubovsky appear to disclose test systems designed to provide a level of abstraction between the test commands a test subject is configured to receive (e.g., a network device in McNeely, or a GUI in Dubovsky), and the test commands that are used by that particular test system. Additionally, McNeely, in view of Dubovsky, appears to disclose tool-specific test commands, understood and used only by that test system.

However, in accordance with the embodiment recited by Claim 1, directives are logical abstractions of actions that can be performed on a GUI, independent of any of the tool-specific scripting languages. Applicant respectfully submits that although McNeely, in view of Dubovsky, appears to disclose tool-specific scripting languages, neither reference appears to disclose or render obvious directives that are independent of any of the tool-specific scripting languages.

- 9 -

It was asserted in the Office Action that McNeely indicates that a 'new package' is all that is required to support the addition of a test tool. Applicant respectfully submits that both McNeely and Dubovsky appear to provide a means for testing additional test subjects by adding a module or package specific to that test subject. Although McNeely discloses that "communication with GUI-based devices can occur via a graphical user interface if a suitable GUI tester is added via a new package," McNeely, at this section, appears to be referring to devices which use a GUI as the interface with the device's testing system rather than the more common command line interface. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that McNeely does not appear to disclose or suggest adding support for a different test tool, having a different tool-specific scripting language and designed to test different types of test subjects (for example adding support for testing GUIs), as asserted in the Office Action.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 15

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 8 and 15 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-11, 13-14, 16-18, 20-21, and 22-24

Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-11, 13-14, 16-18, 20-21, and 22-24 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 8, or 15. Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-11, 13-14, 16-18, 20-21, and 22-24 have not been addressed separately herein; however, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V.   Request for Interview

In the event the above remarks fail to place the case in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests the opportunity to interview with the Examiner at his convenience, and prior to the issuance of a subsequent Office Action, to assist in expediting prosecution. The Examiner is

- 10 -

invited to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

VI.   **Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

                                                    Respectfully submitted,

Date: ___December 7, 2009___   By: ___/Nathan L. Feld/_____
                                                    Nathan L. Feld
                                                    Reg. No. 59,725

Customer No. 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800

- 11 -